Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

23

24

25

1	INDEX	
2	I	PAGE
3	APPEARANCES	553
4	PRE-JURY COLLOQUY	555
5	JURY CHARGE	558
6	CLOSING STATEMENT BY GILBERT	580
7	CLOSING STATEMENT BY MR. DOWNEY	593
8	REBUTTAL STATEMENT BY GILBERT	601
9	CONCLUSION OF JURY CHARGE	606
10	JURY QUESTION	617
11	JURY VERDICT	621
12	POLLING OF THE JURY	622
13	REPORTER CERTIFICATE	624
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	MORNING SESSION, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2019
2	DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
3	
4	(Proceedings reconvened at 9:01 a.m.)
09:01:14 5	(In Open Court - Jury Not Present)
6	(Defendant Present)
7	
8	DEPUTY CLERK: Please be seated.
9	THE COURT: Good morning.
09:01:43 10	ALL EN MASSE: Good morning, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: I have been presented with the
12	parties' stipulations of fact with jury instructions and
13	with the verdict form.
14	It's my understanding that jury instructions and the
09:02:10 15	verdict form are the product of consultation between
16	counsel, and that the form of the instructions and the
17	verdict form are acceptable to counsel, with all previously
18	stated objections being reserved.
19	And so let me ask counsel for the plaintiff.
09:02:32 20	Are the stipulations, the jury instructions, and the
21	verdict form, as they have been presented to me, acceptable
22	in form to the plaintiff?
23	MS. GREENE: They are, Judge, with reserving
24	all the prior objections.
09:02:47 25	Thanks.

1	THE COURT: And the same question for counsel
2	for the defendant.
3	Are the stipulations, jury instructions, and verdict
4	form acceptable in form, reserving all objections previously
09:03:00 5	made, to the defendant?
6	MS. WILLIAMSON: That's correct, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: I will now call in the jury. I
8	will first read the stipulations of fact, then I'll give the
9	instructions. And following the instructions, there will be
09:03:20 10	closing argument by counsel limited to 30 minutes per side.
11	The jury will then be sent back to deliberate.
12	The other point I wanted to make, there was a question
13	yesterday given to me as to whether or not the jury
14	instructions can be used in closing argument, and they
09:03:50 15	certainly may. That's why I'm giving the instructions to
16	the jury before argument. So to the extent you wish to
17	refer to the instructions, you may do so.
18	Are there any questions before we bring in the jury?
19	MS. WILLIAMSON: Your Honor, do we have hard
09:04:05 20	copies of the final instructions for counsel?
21	THE COURT: I have one copy.
22	MS. WILLIAMSON: Oh, okay.
23	THE COURT: All right?
24	I was under the assumption that what I was being given
09:04:21 25	was a copy of what you had worked on.

1	So do we need another copy?
2	We can get another copy.
3	MS. WILLIAMSON: Yes, Your Honor, if we may.
4	Thank you.
09:04:31 5	THE COURT: I don't know whether the copy
6	machine is working or not.
7	But anything else?
8	MR. DOWNEY: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: You have the stipulations and the
09:04:52 10	verdict form?
11	All right. So all you need is the instructions.
12	MS. WILLIAMSON: Yes.
13	THE COURT: All right.
14	And plaintiff's counsel, you have everything?
09:05:01 15	MR. GILBERT: Yes.
16	THE COURT: Stipulations, instructions, and
17	verdict form?
18	All right.
19	(Pause in proceedings.)
09:07:06 20	THE COURT: Thank you.
21	MS. WILLIAMSON: Thank you.
22	MR. DOWNEY: Thank you.
23	MS. GREENE: Thank you.
24	THE COURT: Anything further from counsel
09:07:22 25	before we bring in the jury?

1	MR. DOWNEY: No, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Mr. DeVan, please bring in the
3	jury.
4	DEPUTY CLERK: All rise for the jury.
09:09:21 5	(The jury entered the courtroom.)
6	DEPUTY CLERK: Please be seated.
7	THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen
8	of the jury.
9	You have now heard all of the testimony and seen all
09:09:42 10	of the exhibits that relate to the matter to be decided in
11	this case, and I will instruct you on the law that you will
12	apply in reaching your verdict.
13	But before I do so, the parties have entered into
14	certain stipulations of fact that I'm about to read to you.
09:10:06 15	You are to consider these facts as established and not in
16	dispute for purposes of this case.
17	And I will read from the stipulation.
18	The parties, through counsel, submit the following
19	stipulations of fact, as if proven in trial:
09:10:24 20	First, on March 16th, 2014, Defendant Raymond Frazier
21	and deputies Andrew Knee and James Nicholson were employees
22	of the Richland County Sheriff's Office.
23	Second, Brian Garber and Sara Knowlton were married in
24	2010.
09:10:49 25	Three, Brian Garber and Sara Knowlton are the parents

1 of two minor children, Holly and Nicholas Garber. Four, on March 16, 2014, Brian Garber and 2 Sara Knowlton resided at 3425 Mill Run Road, Lexington, 3 4 Ohio. Five, Matthew and Connie Garber are the parents of 09:11:16 5 Brian Garber. 6 7 Six, Matt Garber and Connie Garber reside at 3400 Mill 8 Run Road, Lexington, Ohio, across the street from Brian and 9 Sara's home. Seven, Brian Garber was the only child of Matthew and 09:11:40 10 11 Connie Garber. Eight, at approximately 7:10 p.m., on March 16, 2014, 12 13 Richland County sheriff Deputy Knee and Lieutenant 14 Donald Zehner received a call via dispatch to respond to 09:12:04 15 3425 Mill Run Road concerning a domestic violence incident. 16 Nine, upon arriving at the residence, Officers Knee 17 and Zehner spoke with Connie Garber, mother of Brian Garber, and Sara Knowlton, wife of Brian Garber. 18 Ten, Brian Garber was not at the residence when 19 09:12:27 20 Richland County Officers Knee and Zehner arrived. 11, officers searched the surrounding area for Garber, 21 but did not find him. 22 23 12, all Richland County officers who had responded to 2.4 the domestic violence incident left the residence and the 09:12:50 25 surrounding area.

1	13, approximately an hour after the first call,
2	Richland County Sheriff's Office received a second call
3	through dispatch that Garber had been located.
4	14, Officers Knee, Zehner, Frazier, Nicholson, and
09:13:09 5	James Berry responded to 3425 Mill Run Road.
6	15, once on Mill Road, Richland County Sheriff's
7	Office officers learned that Garber was at his parents' home
8	at 3400 Mill Run Road.
9	16, once at 3400 Mill Run Road, Sergeant Nicholson,
09:13:40 10	the shift supervisor, took the lead.
11	17, Officers Nicholson, Knee, and Frazier entered the
12	house.
13	18, the officers went upstairs with Sergeant Nicholson
14	in the lead position, followed by Officers Knee and Frazier.
09:14:01 15	19, Officers Nicholson, Knee, and Frazier proceeded
16	down the hallway to the upstairs bedroom, the last door on
17	the left.
18	20, other officers, including Zehner, also entered the
19	home, but did not proceed to the bedroom.
09:14:21 20	21, Sergeant Nicholson had a back-and-forth exchange
21	with Brian Garber for approximately 45 seconds to 1 minute.
22	22, Brian Garber was 28 years old at the time of his
23	death.
24	23, at all relevant times to this case,
09:14:46 25	Defendant Raymond Jeffrey Frazier was acting under color of

state law.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

24, Defendant Frazier fired gunshots that proximately caused the death of Brian Garber.

I will now read to you the instructions on the law that you will apply in reaching your verdict in this case.

Members of the jury:

You have heard all the evidence, and it is now time for me to instruct you about the law that you must follow in deciding this case.

I will start by explaining your duties and the general rules that apply in every civil case. Then, I will explain the elements, or parts, of the claims that Plaintiff Elizabeth Goodwin alleges against Raymond Frazier -- alleges Defendant Frazier is liable for.

Then, I will instruct you on damages, which will only apply if you find defendant liable for any of the claims.

After I give you these instructions, the lawyers will present their closing arguments.

Following clothing arguments, I will explain the rules that you must follow during your deliberations in the jury room, and the interrogatories and verdicts that you may return.

Please listen very carefully to everything that I say.

It is your duty as jurors to follow the law as stated in the instructions of the Court, and to apply the rules of

09:15:33 10

09:15:11 5

12

11

13

14

09:15:58 15

16 17

18

19

09:16:19 20

21

22

23

24

09:16:38 25

law so given to the facts as you find them from the evidence in this case.

You have two minute duties as jurors: The first one is to decide what facts -- what the facts are from the evidence that you saw and heard here in court. Deciding what the facts are is your job, not mine, and nothing that I have said or done during this trial was meant to influence your decision about the facts in any way.

Your second duty is to take the law that I will give you, apply it to the facts, and decide if the plaintiff has proven defendant liable by a preponderance of the evidence.

It is my job to instruct you about the law, and you are bound by the oath that you took at the beginning of trial to follow the instructions that I give you, even if you personally disagree with them.

This includes the instructions that I gave you before and during trial and these instructions. All of the instructions are important, and you should consider them together, as a whole.

The lawyers will talk about the law during their arguments. But if what they say is different from what I say, you must follow what I say. What I say about the law controls.

Perform these duties fairly. Do not let any bias, sympathy, or prejudice that you may feel toward one side or

9
09:17:21 10

09:16:57 5

11

12

1

2

3

4

7

8

13

14

09:17:42 15

16

17

18

19

09:17:59 20

21

22

23

24

09:18:18 25

the other influence your decision in any way.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2.4

09:20:18 25

09:18:55 5

09:19:15 10

09:19:36 15

09:19:57 20

All persons are equal before the law.

In this case, Defendant Frazier is a retired sheriff's deputy, and as such, was a law enforcement officer.

Plaintiff Elizabeth Goodwin and Decedent Brian Garber are private citizens.

All parties are equal before the law. Defendant and plaintiff are entitled to the same fair consideration.

You should consider and decide this case as a dispute between persons of equal standing in the community of equal worth, and holding the same or similar situations in life.

All persons stand equal before the law and are to be treated as equals.

In a civil action, like this one, the burden of proof is by preponderance of the evidence. To establish something by a preponderance of the evidence, means to prove that something is more likely true than not.

This standard does not require proof to an absolute certainty, since proof to an absolute certainty is seldom possible in any case.

You may have also heard the term "proof beyond a reasonable doubt." This is a stricter standard that applies in criminal cases only. It does not apply in a civil case, like this one. You should, therefore, put it out of your minds.

In determining whether any fact in issue has been proven by a preponderance of the evidence, you may, unless otherwise instructed, consider the testimony of all witnesses, regardless of who may have called them, and all exhibits received in evidence, regardless of who may have produced them.

During this trial, I have asked witnesses -- well, I haven't asked witnesses any questions.

But in any event, do not assume that I hold any opinions on this matter or on what the outcome of the case should be.

You must make your decision based only on the evidence that you saw and heard here in court. Do not let rumors, suspicions, or anything else that you may have seen or heard outside of court, influence your decision in any way.

Evidence is all the testimony received from the witnesses, including depositions and the exhibits admitted during the trial, the stipulations that the lawyers have agreed to, which I just read to you, and any facts which the Court requires you to accept as true.

Nothing else is evidence. The lawyers' statements and arguments are not evidence. If you remember the facts differently from the way the attorneys have stated them, you should base your decision on what you remember.

The lawyers' questions and objections are not

7

09:20:37 5

1

2

3

4

6

9

09:20:55 10

11 12

13

14

09:21:13 15

16

17 18

19

09:21:39 20

21

22

23

24

09:21:57 25

evidence. My legal rulings are not evidence. And my comments and questions are not evidence.

Certain demonstrative exhibits have been shown to you.

Those exhibits are used for convenience and to help

you -- and to help explain the facts of the case. They are

not themselves evidence or proof of any facts.

During the trial, I may have not let you hear the answers to some of the questions that the lawyers asked, and I may have ordered you to disregard things that you saw or heard, or I struck things from the record. You must completely ignore all these things. Don't even think about them.

Do not speculate about what a witness may have said. You may not draw any inferences from an unanswered question, nor may you consider testimony which has been stricken in reaching your decision.

The law does not require any party to call as witnesses all persons who may have been present at any time or place involved in the case, or who may appear to have some knowledge of the matters at issue in this trial. Nor does the law require any party to produce as exhibits all papers and things mentioned in the evidence in the case.

Make your decision based only on the evidence, as I have defined it here, and nothing else.

You should use your common sense in weighing the

09:22:19 5

7

8

6

1

2

3

4

9

09:22:38 10

12

13

14

09:22:56 15

16

17 18

19

09:23:13 20

21

22

23

2.4

09:23:35 25

09:25:16 25

09:23:54 5

09:24:15 10

09:24:37 15

09:24:51 20

evidence. Consider it in the light of your everyday experience with people and events, and give it whatever weight you believe it deserves. If your experience tells you that certain evidence reasonably leads to a conclusion, you are free to reach that conclusion.

Now, some of you have heard the terms "direct evidence" and "circumstantial evidence."

Direct evidence is simply the evidence like the testimony of an eyewitness, which, if you believe, directly proves a fact. If a witness testified he saw it raining outside, and you believe him, that would be direct evidence that it was raining.

Circumstantial evidence is simply a chain of circumstances that indirectly prove a fact. If someone walked into the courtroom wearing a raincoat covered with drops of water and carrying a wet umbrella, that would be circumstantial evidence from which you could conclude that it was raining.

It is your job to decide how much weight to give the direct and circumstantial evidence. The law makes no distinction between the weight that you should give to either one or say that one is any better evidence than the other. You should consider all the evidence, both direct and circumstantial, and give it whatever weight you believe it deserves.

The law permits you to draw reasonable inferences from the evidence that has been presented. Inferences are deductions or conclusions which reason and common sense lead the jury to draw from facts which has been established by the evidence in this case.

In other words, while you should consider only the evidence in the case, you are not limited solely to what you see and hear as the witnesses testify. You are permitted to draw from the facts which you find have been proved, such reasonable inferences as you feel are justified in light of your common experience.

You may consider the statements approved by a party or witness who testified under oath before trial as evidence of the true of what he or she said in the earlier statements, as well as in deciding what weight to give his or her testimony.

A witness may be discredited or impeached by contradictory evidence, or by evidence that at some other time, the witness has said or done something, or has failed to say or do something that is inconsistent with the witness's present testimony.

If you believe any witness has been impeached, and thus discredited, you may give the testimony of that witness such credibility, if any, you think it deserves.

If a witness is shown knowingly to have testified

09:25:35 5

8

1

2

3

4

6

7

09:25:55 10

11 12

13

14

09:26:15 15

16

17 18

19

09:26:33 20

21

22

23

2.4

09:26:52 25

falsely about any material matter, you have a right to distrust such witness's other testimony, and you may reject all of the testimony of that witness or give it such credibility as you may think it deserves.

You are the sole judges of the credibility of the witnesses and the weight their testimony deserves. You may be guided by the appearance and conduct of a witness or by the manner in which the witness testifies or by the character of the testimony given or by evidence contrary to the testimony.

You should carefully examine all testimony given, the circumstances under which each witness has testified, and every matter in evidence tending to show whether a witness is worthy of belief. Consider each witness's intelligence, motive, and state of mind, and demeanor, or manner, while testifying.

Consider the witness's ability to observe the matter as to which the witness has testified and whether the witness impresses you as having an accurate recollection of these matters.

Also, consider any relation each witness may have with either side of the case, the manner in which each witness may be affected by the verdict, and the extent to which the testimony of each witness is either supported or contradicted by other evidence in the case.

09:27:12 5

09:27:32 10

09:27:56 15

09:28:13 20

2.4

09:28:30 25

Inconsistencies or discrepancies in the testimony of a witness, or between the testimony of different witnesses, may or may not cause you to discredit such testimony. Two or more persons seeing an event may see or hear it differently.

In considering a prior inconsistent statement or conduct, you should consider whether it was simply an innocent error or an intentional falsehood and whether it concerns an important fact or an unimportant detail.

One more point about witnesses.

Sometimes jurors wonder if the number of witnesses who testified makes any difference. Don't make any decision based only on the number of witnesses who testified. What is more important is how believable the witnesses were and how much weight you think their testimony deserves.

Concentrate on that, not the number of witnesses.

Another part of your job as jurors is to decide how credible or believable each witness was. This is your job, not mine. It's up to you to decide if the witness's testimony was believable and how much weight you think it deserves.

You are free to believe everything that a witness said or part of it or none of it at all, but you should act reasonably and carefully in making these decisions.

Let me suggest some things that you -- for you to

09:28:49 5

09:29:07 10

09:29:27 15

09:29:50 20

09:30:05 25

consider in evaluating each witness's testimony.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2.4

09:30:25 5

09:30:43 10

09:31:12 15

09:31:31 20

09:31:49 25

First, ask yourself if the witness was able to clearly see and hear the events. Sometimes even an honest witness may not have been able to see or hear what was happening, or may make a mistake.

Second, ask yourself how good the witness's memory seemed to be. Did the witness seem to be able to accurately remember what happened?

Third, ask yourself if there was anything else that may have interfered with the witness's ability to perceive or remember the events.

Fourth, ask yourself how the witness acted while testifying. Did the witness appear honest or did the witness appear to be lying?

Fifth, ask yourself if the witness had any relationship to the plaintiff or defendant or anything to gain or lose from the case that might influence the witness's testimony. Ask yourself if the witness had any bias, prejudices, or reason for testifying that might cause the witness to lie or to slant the testimony in favor of one side or the other.

Sixth, ask yourself if the witness testified inconsistently while on the witness stand, if the witness said or did something, or failed to say or do something at any other time that is inconsistent with what the witness

said while testifying.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2.4

09:33:19 25

09:32:10 5

09:32:30 10

09:32:43 15

09:33:00 20

If you believe that the witness was inconsistent, ask yourself if this makes the witness's testimony less believable. Sometimes it may; other times, it may not. Consider whether the inconsistency was about something important or about some unimportant detail. Ask yourself if it seemed like an innocent mistake or if it seemed deliberate.

Seventh, and ask yourself how believable the witness's testimony was in light of all the other evidence. Was the witness's testimony supported or contradicted by other evidence that you found believable?

If you believe that a witness's testimony was contradicted by other evidence, remember that people sometimes forget these things; even two honest people who witness the same event may not describe it in exactly the same way.

These are only some of the things that you can consider in deciding how believable each witness was.

You may also consider other things that you think shed some light on the witness's believability. Use your common sense and your everyday experience in dealing with other people. And then decide what testimony you believe and how much weight you think it deserves.

There is one more general subject that I want to talk

to you about before I begin explaining the elements of the claims alleged in this case.

The lawyers for both sides objected to some things that were said or done during the trial. Do not hold this against either side.

The lawyers have a duty to object whenever they think that something is not permitted by the Rules of Evidence.

Those rules are designed to make sure that both sides receive a fair trial.

And do not interpret my rulings on their objections as any indication of how I think the case should be decided.

My rulings were based on the Rules of Evidence, not on how I feel about the case.

Remember that your decision must be based only on the evidence that you saw and heard here in court.

The law to be applied to the plaintiff's excessive force claim is the federal civil rights law which provides that a remedy for individuals who have been deprived of their constitutional rights under color of state law. It is called "Section 1983 of Title 42 of the United States Code," or simply "Section 1983" for short.

Section 1983 states that every person who, under color of any of statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage of any state or territory, or the District of Columbia, subjects or causes to be subjected any citizen of the

09:33:49 10

09:33:36 5

09:34:07 15

09:34:58 25

09:35:20 5

09:35:40 10

09:36:01 15

09:36:19 20

09:36:34 25

United States, or other person within the jurisdiction thereof, to the deprivation of any of rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the constitution and the laws, shall be liable to the party injured in any action at law, sued in equity, or other proper proceedings for redress.

To establish a claim against Defendant Frazier under Section 1983, plaintiff must establish by a preponderance of the evidence each of the following three elements:

First, that the conduct complained of was by a person acting under color of state law;

Second, that this conduct deprived Brian Garber of rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the constitution or laws of the United States; and

Third, that the defendant's acts were the proximate cause of Brian Garber's injuries and the consequent damages sustained by plaintiff.

In this case, the parties have agreed that

Defendant Frazier acted, at all times, under the color of

state law, and that he fired gunshots that proximately

caused the death of Brian Garber. In other words, the first

and third elements of plaintiff's 1983 claim have been

established.

The second element of plaintiff's claim is that Brian Garber was deprived of a federal right by Defendant Frazier.

Under the Fourth Amendment of the United States

Constitution, every person has the right not to be subjected to unreasonable or excessive force while being detained by a law enforcement officer, even if such detention is otherwise made in accordance with due process of law.

Under the Fourth Amendment, a police officer may use only such force as is objectively reasonable under all the circumstances. The use of deadly force is only constitutionally reasonable if Defendant Frazier had probable cause to believe that Brian Garber posed an immediate threat of death or other serious physical harm to him.

Proximate cause means a reasonable belief supported by particular facts of the circumstances.

You must judge the reasonableness of a particular use of force from the perspective of an objectively reasonable officer on the scene and not with the 20/20 vision of hindsight.

Facts known to the officer are relevant to your inquiry. However, an officer's subjective intent or motive is not relevant to your inquiry.

Plaintiff need not show that any defendant intended to deprive Brian Garber of his rights.

In determining whether Defendant Frazier used excessive force in this case, consider all of the

09:37:12 10

09:36:51 5

09:37:29 15

09:37:49 20

09:38:08 25

1 circumstances known to him, including but not limited to: The nature of the crime or other circumstances known 2 3 to him at the time force was applied; 4 Whether Brian Garber posed an immediate threat of death or serious physical harm to him; 09:38:30 5 Whether Brian Garber was actively resisting arrest 6 and/or seizure, or attempting to evade arrest or seizure by 7 8 flight; 9 The amount of time Defendant Frazier had to determine the type and amount of force that reasonably appeared 09:38:47 10 11 necessary, and any changing circumstances during that 12 period; 13 The type and amount of force used; 14 The availability of alternative methods; 09:39:03 15 Whether it was practical for Defendant Frazier to give 16 warning of the immediate use of force and whether such 17 warning was given; and 18 Whether Defendant Frazier violated generally accepted 19 police standards and procedures. 09:39:22 20 I will now instruct you as to the proper measure of 21 damages in this case. 22 Just because I'm instructing you on how to award 23 damages does not mean that I have any opinion on whether or 2.4 not the defendants should be held liable. 09:39:38 25 Instructions as to the measure of damages is given for

your guidance, and should only be considered if, and only if, you find Plaintiff Elizabeth Goodwin, the administrator of the estate of Brian Garber, has proven her claims against Defendant Frazier in this case. If you find this, then you must decide what damages, if any, plaintiff is entitled to recover.

You shall award actual damages only for the injuries which you find that plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

In determining the amount of damages, you will consider economic losses and noneconomic losses, if any, proximately and directly caused by Brian Garber's actual injury, but you may not include any amount solely meant to punish a defendant.

You may award damages for any pain, suffering, or mental anguish that Brian Garber and his beneficiaries experienced as a consequence of the defendant's unlawful conduct. No evidence of monetary value of such intangible things as pain and suffering, mental anguish, and loss of society need to be introduced into evidence.

There is no exact standard for fixing the compensation to be awarded for these elements of damages. Any award you make should be fair in light of the evidence presented at trial.

In determining the amount of any damages that you

09:40:13 10

09:39:58 5

09:40:34 15

09:40:58 20

09:41:12 25

decide to award, you should be guided by dispassionate common sense. You must use sound discretion in fixing an award of damages, drawing reasonable inferences from the facts in evidence. You may not award damages based on sympathy, speculation, or guesswork.

Under Ohio's general survival of actions statute, a decedent's right of action for personal injuries survives and passes to his personal representative and may be instituted for the benefit of the decedent's estate.

In this case, if you find for the plaintiff, you will decide what sum of money will compensate Brian Garber for his economic losses and noneconomic losses that he suffered from the shooting. In making this determination, you may consider:

The conscious pain and suffering that Brian Garber may have experienced during the events at issue;

The emotional and mental harm that Brian Garber may have experienced during the events the issue;

Any other expenditures incurred as a result of Brian Garber's death.

If you find for the plaintiff, you will also decide what sum of money will compensate the next of kin for the injury and loss to them resulting from the wrongful death of Brian Garber.

When deciding damages suffered by reason of the

09:41:58 10

09:41:31 5

12

13

11

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

14

09:42:13 15

16

17

18

19

09:42:35 20

21

22

23

24

09:42:48 25

1 wrongful death, you may consider the following: The loss of support from the reasonably expected 2 earning capacity of Brian Garber; 3 The loss of services of Brian Garber; 4 The loss of society of Brian Garber, including loss of 09:43:04 5 companionship, consortium, care, assistance, attention, 6 7 protection, advice, guidance, counsel, instruction, 8 training, and education suffered by the next of kin; 9 The loss of prospective inheritance to Brian Garber's heirs at law at the time of his death; and 09:43:28 10 11 The mental anguish incurred by the surviving next of 12 kin. 13 You may also award -- you may also make an award for 14 the reasonable funeral and burial expenses, if the plaintiff 09:43:55 15 has established these expenses by a preponderance of the 16 evidence. 17 The burden is on the plaintiff to establish by a 18 preponderance of the evidence that unlawful actions by 19 Defendant Frazier were a proximate cause of any damages 09:44:19 20 sustained in this case. 21 By "proximate cause," I mean that Defendant Frazier's 22 actions were the proximate cause of the damages sustained. 23 Proximate cause means that there must be a sufficient 2.4 causal connection between the acts and omissions by

Defendant Frazier and any damages sustained by the

09:44:34 25

plaintiff.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2.4

09:44:51 5

09:45:09 10

09:45:32 15

09:45:45 20

09:46:02 25

An act or omission is a proximate cause if it will -- if it was a substantial factor in bringing about or actually causing damage. That is, if the damage was a reasonably foreseeable consequence of Defendant Frazier's act or omission.

If the damage was a direct result of a reasonably probable consequence of Defendant Frazier's act or omission, it was proximately caused by such act or omission.

Proximate cause need not always be the nearest cause, either in time or space. In addition, there may be more than one proximate cause of damage.

Now, this concludes the part of my instructions explaining the rules for considering particular testimony and evidence.

And we'll now have the arguments of counsel.

After the arguments conclude, I'll finish up by explaining some things about your deliberation in the jury room.

Now, I want to assure you that I've gone over quite a bit of territory here in these instructions so far, and there will be more.

However, there will be a copy of these instructions given to you to take into the jury room so that if there is anything that you want to read again for yourselves, you'll

Folks, this is our time, right now, to tell you what we think the case is about and summarize some of the evidence and arguments that we feel are important in this case.

21

22

23

2.4

09:47:31 25

Obviously, many of you have taken notes. You have

09:49:31 25

09:48:42 15

09:49:08 20

09:47:56 5

09:48:20 10

some recollection of what occurred. You were very attentive during the trial. So you can rely on those as well.

Buy really, what this case is about was Brian Garber, who was a young man, age 28. Father of two young children. Had a family who loved him, who had a long life ahead of him. But he struggled with mental illness, and that night, he needed help.

But instead, he wound up dead. And he is dead because the defendant here, Jeffrey Frazier, shot him when he didn't need to do so, and when he fired his gun, and used excessive force.

This is a case about common sense. These officers who were there that night are trained to know what a gunshot is. They go to the range every year. They wear headphones to reduce the sound. They definitely know what a gunshot sounds like, and they all describe the moment that they heard what they thought to be a gunshot as a gunshot.

And the suggestion that this could have been, as

Mr. Downey said in his open remarks, a beer can, or anything
but a gun is just simply irrational and defies logic.

We have proven that Frazier was the source of the bang. It could be no one else. He was in the room. And it could be nothing else.

We have proven by a preponderance of the evidence, as the Judge has instructed, that this shooting was

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2.4

09:50:04 5

09:50:24 10

09:50:46 15

09:51:06 20

09:51:28 25

582

unnecessary, and would not have happened if Frazier had not acted objectively unreasonable.

Defendant Frazier is the only defendant in this case. Deputy Knee and Lieutenant Nicholson are not defendants. This case is only about Frazier. And unlike Frazier, Nicholson and Knee did act in accordance with certain reasonable standards. They took cover. They used precaution and tried to escalate the situation.

Now, why? We have some questions about what happened afterwards, and how they got their story straight, but it seems clear that they acted in response to the unjustified actions of Mr. Frazier.

Without Frazier's actions, they would not have shot Brian Garber, and that is because Frazier's conduct went beyond the norm of how a reasonable officer should act.

And finally, this case is about finding the truth in a web of lies. You cannot find that the shooting is reasonable if the justification is based on lies and misrepresentations.

So what do we know for sure about this trial? And what came out of this trial?

First, we know that the officers arrived at the house and went upstairs to the bedroom. We know that when they got there, Nicholson and Knee took positions of cover at the doorway.

Frazier was some distance behind. And to the surprise of his fellow officers at the time, he walked into the room. Nicholson, the sergeant in charge, did not want him there, and Frazier himself even admitted, It wasn't the best idea in the world.

It certainly was not.

Next, they attempted to communicate with Brian.

Nicholson wanted to deescalate the situation. And while he did it, he even had his gun -- lowered the barrel of his gun so he could communicate with Brian. All three officers had their eyes fixed directly on Brian during this entire exchange and communication, and the room was well lit.

This conversation lasted, as stipulated in our statement of facts, for 45 seconds to a minute. This is a long time for police to assess a situation and react.

During that entire time, even though they said there was a protrusion under Brian's shirt, all three officers have clearly stated that they did not need to shoot during that period of time. Only one person in the bedroom had a qun, and that was Defendant Frazier.

Brian Garber never had a gun. He was unarmed. But they want you to believe that they were certain that when that loud bang occurred, it was a gun coming from Brian Garber.

All three officers have been adamant that they heard a

09:51:54 5

09:52:11 10

09:52:34 15

09:52:59 20

09:53:23 25

bang, and the bang sounded like a gunshot. All three officers are clear that this bang definitely came from inside the room.

After this shooting, BCI Agent Cory Momchilov, who you heard in this trial, testified that no other source could be identified for a sound that loud, or any sound that would seem like a gunshot.

Until this day, none of them could come up with a theory, even speculation, of how a gunshot could have been in that room, and the only reasonable explanation is that it came from Defendant Frazier.

Nicholson and Knee clearly testified that the reason they shot Brian Garber was because of that bang, not because of any movements by Brian. And we know that none of the officers saw a muzzle flash from Brian's direction.

As a result of all this, Brian was shot 14 times. 14 times. We know that Frazier fired first. And remember -- and this is very important -- that Knee is clear that Frazier fired first.

Frazier shot more than anybody that was there. He testified he fired 8 to 10 shots.

Nicholson fired twice.

And Knee testified that he fired three times.

We brought the medical examiner in, Dr. Lisa Kohler, who said that there were 14 entrance wounds. And you will

8

09:53:42 5

1

2

3

4

6

7

9

09:54:06 10

12

11

13 14

09:54:29 15

16

17

18

19

09:54:53 20

21

22

23

24

09:55:13 25

note that three entered into the back of Brian's body. A number of these shots hit vital organs.

And when it was all done, all the officers were certain that they never saw a remote on the bed. But that -- but somehow, that remote appeared in photos taken shortly after the shooting. Those photos were taken by Lieutenant Zehner, who was in the room alone for some period of time.

There's no question that the remote was in plain site, yet no one admits they saw it. These are trained officers to observe and know what they're doing.

And the remote was tested, and Agent Momchilov testified that the remote could not be linked to Brian Garber through either fingerprints or DNA comparisons.

After the shooting, then all three officers talked about the shooting in the kitchen. And as Deputy Knee acknowledged, he understands how it could look to have officers discussing a shooting event.

And you can consider that when they came up with this, the same page about what was under the shirt looked like a Glock, was designed to justify what they claim was an imminent danger.

Officers are supposed to be separated. They're supposed to be given the opportunity to give statements without any type of influence by anybody else. That didn't

9
09:55:55 10

09:55:35 5

11 12

13

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

14

09:56:21 15

17

16

18

19

09:56:39 20

21

22

23

24

09:57:00 25

happen here.

09:58:47 25

09:57:15 5

09:57:36 10

09:58:01 15

09:58:21 20

I'd also like to point out what is not relevant in this case.

You heard the officer -- you heard Deputy Frazier talk about all of his commendations. Well, regardless of whether or not an officer has received awards, has ever done good or kind things in his life, doesn't mean that he didn't violate the law or distort the truth on another occasion.

We should be focused on what happened in the room.

And we also think that what is not relevant in this case is any attempt to disparage either Brian or his family, because that has nothing to do with whether the officers acted reasonably; and particularly, Defendant Frazier, whether he acted objectively reasonable when he fired his shots at Brian Garber.

Marital struggles, prior suicide attempts in association with Brian's mental illness, and the loss of their daughter to sudden infant death syndrome, none of this is relevant to whether it was reasonable for Frazier to pull the trigger and kill Brian Garber.

So much has been focused on the domestic violence incident on March 16, 2014. This clearly was a manifestation of Brian's mental illness, and it was unfortunate. It was ugly. But this is really just background about why Brian needed help.

1 Yes, it led to the information that there was a possible gun that he had, but it doesn't change what 2 3 happened in the room: How Frazier approached the situation. 4 How he went into the room. How he put himself in a position of danger. All that is what is in relevant in this case. 09:59:11 5 And the question is whether Defendant Frazier's use of 6 deadly force was objectively reasonable under all the 7 8 circumstances. 9 His decision to shoot Brian Garber is constitutionally reasonable only if he had probable cause to believe that 09:59:30 10 11 Brian posed an immediate threat of death or serious physical 12 harm. 13 But really, what is important here is how you would 14 determine the truth in this trial. 09:59:42 15 What did Frazier tell you about what he did and what 16 he saw? 17 You heard at this trial -- and we spent a lot of time going over the inconsistent statements. In the trial, he 18 said Brian lifted his shirt with his left hand. That he saw 19 09:59:56 20 a black object in Brian's hand. He said Brian's whole hand 21 did not come out from under the shirt, and then he heard a 22 pop, and then he fired. 23 Then we bring in a November 2014 previous statement, where he said he saw Brian move forward in a hurried manner 2.4

before all this started. In one version, he said Brian

10:00:17 25

1	started to extend his right hand out. In another version,
2	he said Brian brought his entire hand out.
3	Frazier said in statements that he only fired his
4	weapon after he saw Brian start to lift his shirt and
10:00:35 5	presented what appeared to be a weapon.
6	He said that when he started firing, Brian was not
7	dying. He was not dying, so he kept firing, as if that is
8	the standard for why you shoot, to make sure somebody's
9	dead.
10:00:52 10	That was in November 2014.
11	In December of 2015, during a deposition, here's what
12	Frazier said:
13	"Before the pop, did you see his arm or hand come out
14	of the area of the shirt?
10:01:14 15	"I did not.
16	"Did if you ever see his hand come out of his shirt?
17	"No.
18	"Did you ever see him point a gun at you?
19	"Just what I perceived to be underneath the shirt.
10:01:22 20	"Did you ever see him extend his arm?
21	"No, sir.
22	"Did you ever see him lift his shirt and present a
23	firearm to you?
24	"No, sir.
10:01:31 25	"Did you ever see Brian brandish what you thought

1 looked like a gun? 2 "No, sir. "So you never saw him with an object in his hand? 3 "Visibly, I did not see him with a gun, no. 4 "Or an object? 10:01:44 5 "I did not see any objects in his hand. Whatever he 6 7 had was under his shirt." 8 This is diametrically contradictory to what he said in 9 the trial. It's contradictory to what he said in November of 2014, when he prepared a written statement with his 10:01:59 10 11 lawyer, and had time to think about what happened, and 12 present it to authorities. 13 We don't really know why he shot Brian, but we know 14 that it happened, and we know that he's lying about it. 10:02:19 15 Police have a duty to be clear and accurate, not all 16 over the map and waffling back and forth. 17 And we know that Frazier has been described by his 18 superior, Captain Bosko, as a hothead, and sometimes viewed 19 as unbelievable, and is thought to exaggerate, manipulate, 10:02:44 20 and has been caught in false statements. 21 We know that Dr. Aaron Becker, who examined Frazier 22 for fitness of duty, said that "He has little patience and 23 low frustration and tolerance. He admits that he learned to

back off in certain situations and call for another officer

24

to deal with it."

10:02:59 25

All this relates to credibility.

You heard the Judge give you instructions on credibility. When you look at Defendant Frazier, it's obvious he's not a credible witness. And even his own partners contradict him in what he said happened in that room.

So we know that three bullets entered his back of his body, one of them through the left arm, at the elbow, exiting -- think about how that could have happened. One through the back of the right thigh, which is lodged near his right femur, which fractured from the shot.

And at the end of the shooting, his hands were over to his right. No one can explain how those hands got up. And they all said that the hands were by -- under the shirt.

We leave you to figure that out.

So when you take all this information together, there is only one conclusion to draw, and that is that Defendant Frazier violated Brian's constitutional rights.

And we ask you to hold him accountable.

Brian Garber is dead, and now we have two kids without a father and an entire family who grieves their loss. And though it feels like an impossible question to answer, it's your job to decide what that loss is worth.

And, yes, Brian Garber had struggled with mental health issues, and sometimes he struggled to keep it

10:03:32 10

10:03:15 5

12 13

14

11

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10:03:53 15

16

17 18

19

10:04:15 20

21

22

23

24

10:04:40 25

10:06:26 25

10:05:47 15

10:06:05 20

10:05:00 5

10:05:28 10

together. But there's no doubt he supported his family by obtaining a higher education and working and by doing everything he could to take care of his family.

He did this in spite of his issues.

Most important, Brian Garber loved his children, and his children loved him. But now, they'll never get to have all of those experiences we all love having with our own parents and relish having with our own kids.

He'll never be able to attend father/daughter dances with his daughter. He'll never be able to reach -- or to teach Holly how to drive. He'll never be able to teach Nick to throw a baseball. He'll never be able to cheer for his kids at sporting events. He won't be able to walk his daughter down the aisle.

And Nick, who has special needs, who will need his father to help him, will not have that guidance and provide him for years to come.

They will never have all of these moments in their lives.

And so what is the value of this tremendous loss, ladies and gentlemen?

Really, no amount of money can replace that. We can only ask for money, but we would suggest that it should be substantial. We would suggest, but it's up to you, that the loss of these children not having a father is worth at least

a million dollars to each child.

As far as his earning capacity, he did have a track record of working. He could have lived to another 50 years or so. He probably could have worked until he was 65. And even if he was working part time and making minimum wage, he at least would make a half a million dollars over the next 40 years. And this is the bare minimum.

But remember, he was just starting out in his career path related to his degree when this happened. He had just graduated from DeVry University, and he was working in the profession he went to school for. And he wasn't able to continue on that path because his life was taken away. He had a 4.0 GPA and graduated with honors.

So what would his earning capacity have been? Is it 500,000? Is it 700,000? Is it a million?

And don't forget that he also was providing childcare to his kids. And what is that worth?

And when you take all these matters together: The loss of life, the conscious pain and suffering as Frazier continued to shoot him because he would not die, and the pain and suffering, we don't think it is unreasonable, members of the jury, to come up with a damage figure between 3 to \$6 million, or more.

But this is your decision. A life was taken. People suffered. His children will suffer for the rest of their

10:06:47 5

10:07:07 10

10:07:34 15

10:07:55 20

10:08:19 25

1 life. 2 So this was not just a horrible tragedy. It was a 3 horrible tragedy that never should have happened. 4 So we urge you to come back with a verdict for the plaintiff and award compensation that is fair and just. 10:08:35 5 6 Thank you. THE COURT: Mr. Downey? 7 MR. DOWNEY: Thank you, Your Honor. 8 9 May it please the Court. Thank you, Your Honor, counsel. 10:09:05 10 11 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, thank you so much 12 for your service. It is appreciated. 13 When I spoke to you a few days ago, I talked to you 14 about choices. You know, you've heard the evidence, and you 10:09:23 15 now know the standard: It's a preponderance of the 16 evidence. 17 That means that you have to decide whether it was more 18 likely than not that Deputy Frazier violated the 19 constitution when he shot Brian Garber. 10:09:34 20 I submit to you that the evidence has shown that he 21 did not violate the constitution; that he acted reasonably 22 and appropriately in his interactions with Mr. Garber. 23 But, again, it starts with choices. And, you know, as

Mr. Gilbert noted during his portion of the opening,

Brian Garber was a troubled young man. There's no question

2.4

10:09:52 25

10:11:11 25

10:10:09 5

10:10:26 10

10:10:40 15

10:10:56 20

about that. He had a troubled marriage. He had suicide attempts in his record. He had elicit drug use in his record. It is a sad tragedy, the way that he ended his life and the way he choose to live it at the end.

We also know, though, that choices were made by Brian

We also know, though, that choices were made by Brian that day. And it really does start with breaking in the door in the back of the house he shared with Sara Knowlton.

And when you read the instructions that Judge Baughman gives you, you're going to see that the criminal act that Mr. Garber committed that day is something that is factored into what the deputies are thinking as they stand across from his bedroom.

It's a violent act. He breaks through the door. His mom is with him when he does that. He goes into the house. He kits his mother. Okay. He hits his mother. He strangles his wife. His children are there. Okay?

This is violence. This is criminal. That's what he did.

And Connie and Sara did what people do when confronted with something like this, they called the police. Okay.

And the police came.

Deputy Knee came. Lieutenant Zehner came. They came and interacted with Connie and Sara. They took their statements. They took evidence. They took a photo. You saw it.

1 You know, did the family downplay some of the violence and some of the things that Brian did? Yes. 2 There was a mark. You saw it. He hit her. And you 3 4 heard her. He was going nuts over here. He's breaking things. 10:11:26 5 Then he fled. When Deputy Knee got there and 6 7 Lieutenant Zehner got there, and they took an evaluation of 8 the situation, they called for backup. Now, you folks know there are five officers on a shift 9 in Richland County. They cover 500 miles of territory. All 10:11:36 10 11 five of them were at that house. All five of them were 12 interacting and attempting to locate Brian Garber and take statements from Connie and Sara. 13 14 Why were they doing that? 10:11:51 15 Because that was a serious, violent act, and that's 16 how they deal with domestic violence in Richland County. 17 So while those statements are being taken, 18 Deputy Frazier, with 17 years of law enforcement experience, 19 and a number of commendations that you do get to consider in your deliberations, he went and looked for Brian Garber. 10:12:06 20 21 Tried to locate him. He didn't. 22 We know it's stipulated in the record that a call came 23 out an hour later, but some things happened between then and 2.4 when the officers left.

Connie took the two children and went across the

10:12:19 25

1	street to the house she shared with Matt where Brian grew
2	up. And she interacted with Brian in the room, the bedroom,
3	the very bedroom where this shooting occurred.
4	And what do we know from that room? What's undisputed
10:12:32 5	now in the evidence of this case?
6	It's undisputed that Brian Garber was seated on his
7	bed, wearing a T-shirt with an object under his shirt that
8	he presented as a firearm, a gun.
9	Now, you heard his dad's statements to Cory Momchilov
10:12:47 10	that night. It had the outline of a gun. It wasn't a hand.
11	It wasn't a finger.
12	We know those officers perceived a gun, we know
13	Matt Garber perceived a gun, and we know Brian Garber wanted
14	them to believe it was a gun. We know those things. Those
10:13:01 15	are undisputed facts in the record of this case.
16	So what did Matt and Connie do with that information?
17	What did they do?
18	Matt said, Go down there and talk to the police.
19	Connie heads over to Sara's house. While she's in
10:13:13 20	transit, Brian Garber is threatening to kill his wife.
21	Officers knew that, too. Threatening to kill his wife.
22	I get out of the jail someday, what I'm going to do,
23	I'm going to kill you.

That's what what's going on. What's really sad is,

this is a domestic call. These officers do those calls two

24

10:13:27 25

1 to three times per week. Serve and protect. They made a 2 choice, too. They serve and protect the community. That's 3 what they do. That's what they do for a living. Okay? 4 And when they get the call that Brian Garber had a qun, and he's been located, every doggone one of them was 10:13:43 5 back there. And they called other jurisdictions in to 6 7 assist: Lexington, Bellevue. Seven officers on the scene 8 within minutes. 9 So when they enter Matt Garber's home, what do we know? What do the officers know? 10:13:54 10 11 They know it's a domestic incident, they know there 12 was violence, they know he may have a gun. You also heard 13 that's typical with the domestic incidents that these 14 officers face on a daily basis. 10:14:12 15 There are guns in the home, and there are violence. 16 So they know that. They don't do a tactical plan because 17 you don't do tactical plans when you go out to a domestic 18 incident. 19 You heard sergeant -- then Sergeant Nicholson, now 10:14:24 20 Lieutenant Nicholson, talk about what happens in these 21 domestic incidents when he goes and interacts with subjects. 22 They comply. They listen. They take his instruction.

police officer or asked for their license. They comply.

They do what typical people do when they're pulled over by a

23

24

10:14:38 25

That's what you do. You have your common sense. You

1 get to bring it into the jury room. You get to bring your 2 experiences into the jury room. That's typical. That's what people do when they 3 interact with law enforcement. 4 So when they enter the house, this is still a typical 10:14:50 5 situation. They go in the house. They go up the stairs. 6 7 They go to the end of the hallway. 8 Where does it stop being typical? 9 Sergeant Nicholson's on the right. Deputies on the 10:15:02 10 left. Deputy Frazier goes in the house. He doesn't have 11 his gun drawn. He goes into the room. 12 Brian Garber, first words, I have a gun. First words. 13 He presents what looks like a gun. We know that. 14 It's undisputed that these officers believed he had a gun. 10:15:18 15 I would submit to you from that moment on -- so when 16 the shooting occurred -- these officers were justified on 17 the constitution and the instructions that you got to fire 18 on Brian Garber. 19 But they didn't do that. Deputy Frazier is trained. Sergeant Nicholson is trained. He's a CIT. You heard what 10:15:32 20 21 that is. Deputy Frazier attempts to talk to Brian Garber. 22 Show me your hands. Drop the gun. 23 He doesn't comply. He doesn't do what he's asked by 2.4 these law enforcement officers. These are proper commands.

And by the way, you've heard nothing to suggest that

10:15:45 25

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

10:17:02 25

10:16:30 15

10:16:46 20

10:16:00 5

10:16:15 10

anything that these officers did violates policy or police practices. Nothing. Fine law enforcement officers.

So what do they do when confronted with a gun?

Now, you all heard 45 seconds to a minute in opening statement. Okay? Imagine somebody standing across from you with a gun pointed at you for 45 seconds to a minute. Right at you.

Do you need to hear a threat from them verbally to know that you're being threatened? To know that your life is in danger?

These officers knew that. They knew that the entire time. But they stood there and they attempted to talk him down. Deputy Frazier spoke. And then he stopped. He deferred. His supervisor was present with him just outside the room.

And Sergeant Nicholson began to work with Brian Garber. Doesn't have to end like this. We all have families. Show us your hands.

He talked to him for 45 seconds to a minute with a gun trained on each of these officers, thinking that they could be shot at any second, and they did not act.

I submit to you that that is a great law enforcement officer, and that the officer that you hear described in these 45 seconds to a minute is the same one that had all those commendations.

What did they hear?

They heard a pop. They heard a bang. They reacted.

Split second. One to two seconds, shooting is over. One to two seconds.

It's a tragedy. It's a tragedy what happened to Brian Garber. He lost his life. It's also a tragedy for his family.

Well, these officers, Deputy Frazier, he's living with that every day for the rest of his life as well.

You also heard that these officers, between the three of them, have discharged their firearms four times in the line of duty in 50 years of service. That's not a hot head.

They take the use of deadly force very seriously, and they know that you will as well. Deputy Frazier knows that you will.

The evidence that you heard in this case is of a law enforcement officer who acted properly, who was objectively reasonable. And when you sit there in the room and you deliberate, understand that this officer believed that that man had a gun.

It doesn't matter one bit whether or not there was a remote control on the bed, or whether or not in the aftermath of a shooting where a man died, they observed everything in a room as they're trying to figure out what just happened.

8

10:17:13 5

1

2

3

4

6

7

9

10:17:30 10

11 12

13

14

10:17:49 15

16

17

18

19

10:18:00 20

21

23

22

24

10:18:17 25

1	It doesn't matter. It matters what they perceived at
2	the time. It's not 20/20 hindsight. We know now
3	Brian Garber didn't have a gun. We know that now, but these
4	officers did not know that then.
10:18:28 5	And Deputy Frazier, he answered Mr. Gilbert's
6	questions. He's answered questions about this four or five
7	times. He'll live with it the rest of his life. He thinks
8	about it daily.
9	He didn't violate the constitution.
10:18:41 10	And we submit to you that when you review the
11	evidence, you deliberate, we ask you to find in his favor.
12	Thank you very much.
13	THE COURT: Rebuttal?
14	MR. GILBERT: Rebuttal.
10:19:03 15	THE REPORTER: One second, Mr. Gilbert. You
16	have to have put the microphone on.
17	MR. GILBERT: Oh, okay.
18	Thank you very much.
19	Ladies and gentlemen, there are standards of policing
10:19:20 20	involved in this case.
21	There are objectively reasonable ways this matter
22	could have been handled better.
23	Mr. Downey doesn't see fit to talk about the
24	45 seconds to a minute when no one felt the need to use
10:19:41 25	deadly force.

1 Now, he's saying, Well, they could have. But that's not the standard. The standard is, what caused the moment 2 3 that they fired the shots? 4 And they all said it was a bang coming from inside the room. The bang was definitely the sound of the gunshot. 10:20:01 5 And all the officers were clear, they did not need to shoot 6 until they heard that bang. 7 8 He keeps saying there was a gun in that room. There 9 was no gun in that room. The only guns that were there were the officers' gun. 10:20:19 10 11 They were clear that they didn't need to shoot until 12 they -- they were clear they didn't have justification to 13 shoot for 45, 50 seconds. 14 The only man in that room with a gun was Frazier. 10:20:34 15 Brian didn't have a gun. Frazier is the source of the bang. 16 It could be no one and nothing else. There was no reason 17 for Frazier to shoot during that conversation. He fired the 18 shot that caused the others to fire, too. 19 Now, you got to look at all the surrounding 10:20:52 20 circumstances. That's very important. You got to look at 21 why somebody put that remote on that bed. Even Deputy Knee 22 said there couldn't have been a remote. 23 Why would they need to do that? Why would somebody

like Zehner, who took the picture of it, say he never saw

the remote when he put a flashlight right on the remote for

2.4

10:21:11 25

the county prosecutor, Bambi Page-Couch, to see? Why are they lying about this?

Just tell the truth.

Is it because they realized that they overreacted and fired a shot that -- a barrage of 14 shots that they shouldn't have done, and they needed a way to protect theirselves and justify by having something that could possibly look like a gun?

This is not abstract. This is real, folks.

And you understand that Mr. Downey didn't even address all the inconsistent statements that Frazier made in this case.

Why does he need to talk about extending the arm, pointing, showing objects? You know, extending the arm, lifting the shirt, brandishing? Why did Frazier need to tell the investigators this after the shooting?

Because it makes it look like it's justifiable to use deadly force.

But then, when the other two deputies that were there consistently said they did not see any of that, they did not see any of that movement, they did not see an object, he had to conform his story to what those other two deputies claimed so they can all be on the same page, just so they can all be on the same page as to, they saw what appeared to be a Glock.

10:21:54 10

10:21:31 5

11

13

12

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

14

10:22:20 15

16 17

18

19

10:22:39 20

21

22

23

٥٦

10:23:04 25

1 So a trial is a search for the truth. Without the truth, you can't make a decision that supports the defense 2 3 side. 4 There were so many misrepresentations. So many contradictions in this case. So many efforts to subterfuge 10:23:26 5 6 reality. 7 Mr. Downey could not explain, Cory Momchilov could not 8 explain, nobody in the last five years can explain how that 9 sound could have come from anywhere else or anyplace else than a gun. 10:23:57 10 11 And Frazier put himself in a position of danger. The 12 other two knew better. Even the rookie, Knee, was smart 13 enough not to run into that room, because they had the 14 opportunity outside of the room to communicate, to take 10:24:20 15 cover, to assess their situation, to be able to react. 16 Frazier was not supposed to be in that room. They 17 both said that. And it set, in the chain of events, a 18 horrible, tragic, and unnecessary shooting death of 19 Brian Garber. A young man who had trouble. 10:24:45 20 But, yes, so there was some violence at the house an 21 hour and a half earlier with his wife and his mother. They 22 didn't want him to be arrested and put in jail for the 23 night. They wanted to get some medical health -- mental

They were over-blowing what happened in that.

2.4

10:25:05 25

health treatment.

1 Connie Garber said that, you know, she didn't need any medical attention. 2 Sara Knowlton told you he didn't strangle her. He had 3 his hands on his collarbone. 4 None of that matters, folks. What matters is what 10:25:24 5 6 happened in the room, and what happened in the room was 7 wrong, clearly and simple. And then there were lies made to 8 try to cover it up. 9 And the lies were from this man, Defendant Frazier, who has to live not with the idea that he killed somebody, 10:25:37 10 11 but he has to live with the notion that he is quilty of 12 doing something wrong. That's what he --13 You saw the fake tears up there. You heard about the doctor who analyzed him and said he had some serious 14 10:26:03 15 medical -- mental health issues. 16 You heard his supervisor talk about low tolerance, 17 frustration, he's not believable. But they don't want to 18 talk about that. 19 They just want to talk that they serve their 10:26:23 20 community, they're good cops, that Frazier has all of these 21 commendations, and you should believe them. That's their 22 case. 23 So we ask you, once, again, to do the right thing. To

find him liable based on the instructions that the Court

gave you, and award significant damages to help his children

2.4

10:26:41 25

1 live a life that will be -- somehow compensate for them. 2 And they knew that they got -- that a court of law, a jury, 3 gave them justice, this family. 4 Thank you very much. THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, 10:27:15 5 let me now finish by explaining some things to you about 6 7 your deliberations in the jury room. 8 The first thing that you should do in the jury room is 9 to choose someone to be your foreperson. This person will help you guide your discussions and will be your 10:27:30 10 11 spokesperson for you here in court. 12 Once you start deliberating, do not -- do not talk to 13 the courtroom deputy or to me or to anyone else about the 14 case. We must communicate in writing. Write down your 10:27:50 15 message, have the foreperson sign it, and then give it to 16 the courtroom deputy. That's Mr. DeVan. 17 He will give it to me, and I will respond as soon as I 18 can. 19 I may have to talk to the lawyers about what you've 10:28:05 20 asked, so it may take me some time to get back to you. 21 One more thing about messages. 22 Do not ever write down or tell anyone how you stand on 23 your vote. For example, if there is some split among the 24 jury at the time, please don't disclose that. That should

remain secret until you are finished.

10:28:27 25

1 Remember that if you elected to take notes during the trial, your notes should be used only as memory aids. You 2 3 should not give your notes greater weight than your 4 independent recollection of the evidence. You should rely upon your independent recollection of 10:28:46 5 the evidence, or lack of evidence, and you should not 6 7 unduly -- be unduly influenced by the notes or other jurors. 8 Notes are not entitled to any more weight than the memory or 9 impression of each juror. 10:29:02 10 Whether you took notes or not, each of you must form 11 and express your own opinions as to the facts in this case. 12 If any reference by the Court or by counsel to matters 13 of evidence does not coincide with your recollection, it is 14 your recollection which should control your deliberations. 10:29:25 15 Remember that you must make your decision based only 16 on the evidence that you saw and heard here in court. 17 During your deliberations, you must not communicate 18 with or provide any information to anyone by means -- by any 19 means about the case. 10:29:42 20 You may not use any electronic devices or media, such 21 as telephone, cell phone, Smartphone, iPhone, BlackBerry, or 22 computer, the Internet, any Internet service, or any text or 23 instant messaging service, any Internet chat room, blog, or 24 website, such as Facebook, My Space, Instagram, Snapchat,

LinkedIn, YouTube or Twitter, to communicate to anyone any

10:30:06 25

information about this case, or to conduct any research about this case, until I accept your verdict.

In other words, you cannot talk to anyone on the phone, correspond with anyone, or electronically communicate with anyone about the case. You can only discuss the case in the jury room with your fellow jurors during deliberation.

I expect you will inform me as soon as you become aware of another juror's violation of these instructions.

You may not use these electronic means to investigate or communicate about the case, because it's important that you decide this case based solely on the evidence presented in this courtroom.

Information on the Internet or available through social media might be wrong, incomplete, or inaccurate. You are only permitted to discuss the case with your fellow jurors during deliberations because they have seen and heard the same evidence you have.

In our judicial system, it's important that you're not influenced by anything or anyone outside of this courtroom.

Otherwise, your decision may be based on information known only by you, and not -- and not your fellow jurors or the parties in the case. This would unfairly and adversely impact the judicial process.

You should know that if this admonition is violated,

10:30:23 5

10:30:38 10

10:30:53 15

10:31:08 20

10:31:29 25

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2.4

10:32:52 25

10:32:20 15

10:32:33 20

10:31:46 5

10:32:04 10

there could be a mistrial. A mistrial means that the case is stopped before it is finished and must be retried again at a later date.

This can lead to a great deal of expense for the parties and for the taxpayers; namely, you and your neighbors. No one wants to see money, especially tax dollars, wasted.

If a mistrial were to be declared based on a violation of this admonition, the juror responsible could be required to pay the cost of the first trial and could be pushed for contempt of court.

In summary, make your decision based only on the evidence that you saw and heard here in this court.

When you enter the jury room following the arguments, you are free to talk about the case. In fact, it's your duty to talk with each other about the evidence and to make every reasonable effort you can to reach a unanimous agreement.

Talk with each other, listen carefully and respectfully to each other's views, and keep an open mind as you listen to what your fellow jurors have to say. Try your best to work out your differences. Don't hesitate to change your mind if you are convinced that other jurors are right and you are wrong.

But do not ever change your mind just because other

jurors see things differently or just to get the case over with. In the end, your vote must be exactly that -- your own vote.

It's important that you reach a unanimous agreement, but only if you can honestly and in good conscience -- if you can do so honestly and in good consensus.

No one will be allowed to hear your discussions in the jury room, and no record will be made of what you say. So you should all feel free to speak your minds.

Listen carefully to what everyone else has to say, and then decide for yourself if the plaintiff has proven her claims by a preponderance of the evidence. Your sole interest is to seek the truth from the evidence in this case.

You will have a copy of these instructions with you in the jury room for your assistance during deliberations.

These instructions should answer any questions that you have.

However, if during your deliberations you should desire to communicate with the Court, please reduce your message or question into writing, signed by the foreperson, and pass the note to the courtroom deputy, who will bring you -- bring it to my attention.

I will then respond as promptly as possible, either in writing or by having you return to the courtroom so that I $\,$

10:33:32 10

10:33:10 5

10:33:49 15

10:34:03 20

10:34:17 25

can address you orally.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

10:35:54 25

10:34:34 5

10:34:50 10

10:35:18 15

10:35:38 20

Remember at all times, you are not partisans. You are judges. The judges of the facts. Your sole interest is to seek the truth from the evidence in the case.

Your verdict, whether for the plaintiff or defendant, must be unanimous.

This means that to find for the plaintiff on her claim with respect to Defendant Frazier, every one of you must agree that the plaintiff has proved that claim against Defendant Frazier by a preponderance of the evidence.

Either way, your verdict must be unanimous.

I have prepared verdict forms that you should use to record your verdict. The form reads as follows:

Roman Numeral I, Liability, A, excessive force.

We the jury, on plaintiff's excessive force claim under 42, United States Code, Section 1983, find the following as to Defendant Frazier:

Check 1, liable, not liable.

If you find defendant not liable on the claim, stop here, and sign the verdict below.

If you find the defendant liable on the claim, continue to Sections II and III.

Next II, Survivorship Damages. If you find

Defendant Frazier liable, enter an amount below that will

fairly and reasonably compensate the estate of Brian Garber

1 for the conscious pain, suffering, emotional and mental harm 2 that Brian Garber may have experienced during the events at 3 issue, and economic harm that may have been incurred. 4 Please state your answer in dollars and cents, survivorship damages, and then the line for the amount. 10:36:14 5 Roman Numeral III, Wrongful Death Damages. 6 7 If you find Defendant Frazier liable, enter an amount 8 that will fairly and reasonably compensate the beneficiaries 9 of the estate for the injuries and losses to them resulting from the wrongful death of Brian Garber. 10:36:32 10 11 Please state your answer in dollars and cents, 12 wrongful death damages, wrongful death damages, and then a 13 line for the number to be inserted. 14 Each of us jurors concurring in the said verdict, sign 10:36:51 15 his or her name hereto on this blank -- whatever date you 16 reached the verdict -- of February, in the year 2019. And 17 then there is a line for the signature of the jury 18 foreperson, and each of you jurors. 19 You will take the interrogatories and verdict form to 10:37:16 20 the jury room, where you have -- and when you have reached 21 unanimous agreement as to your verdict, you will have your 22 foreperson fill in each answer, sign his or her name, and 23 date the form in the bottom right-hand corner. Each of you

will then sign the interrogatories and verdict form.

Please complete these documents in ink. Unless all of

24

10:37:33 25

you agree, you may not return an answer to any question.

After you've all signed the appropriate documents, ring the jury buzzer, which is on the wall in the jury room, and you will be returned to the courtroom as soon as we have gathered all the parties and their counsel.

Let me finish up by repeating something that I told you earlier.

Nothing that I have said or done during this trial was meant to influence your decision in any way. Nothing said in these instructions is meant to suggest or convey in any way what verdict I think you should find.

What the verdict shall be is the sole and exclusive duty and responsibility of the jury. You shall decide for yourselves if plaintiff has proved by a preponderance of the evidence its claims against the defendant.

The courtroom deputy will escort you to the jury room, and you will then receive a copy of the Court's charge, the verdict form and the exhibits that have been admitted into evidence.

If a juror is not following the law as I have just given it to you, the rest of you must make sure that I am told.

With two exceptions, all the exhibits are in paper.

Those exceptions are the remote, and there's also a very short audio recording.

10:37:51 5

8

9

7

1

2

3

4

6

10:38:04 10

11 12

13

14

10:38:21 15

16 17

18

19

10:38:39 20

21

22

23

24

10:39:00 25

1	If you wish to see the remote, there are special
2	procedures for handling that remote. Let Mr. DeVan know.
3	He will bring it in, and he will handle it according to
4	those special procedures as you view it.
10:39:22 5	If it's necessary, or if you wish to listen to the
6	audio that has been admitted into evidence, then you will
7	need some special equipment. Let Mr. DeVan know, and
8	arrangements will be made for you to listen to the audio.
9	Counsel for the plaintiff, have I read the
10:39:44 10	instructions accurately as agreed to by counsel, except with
11	objections being reserved?
12	MR. GILBERT: Yes, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: And counsel for the defendant,
14	have I read the instructions accurately as agreed to by
10:40:01 15	counsel, reserving the objections that have been previously
16	made?
17	MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Your Honor.
18	THE COURT: All right. Very well.
19	I do want to just make one final comment.
10:40:11 20	And that is, one of the benefits of presiding at a
21	trial is that I get to spend time watching the jurors and
22	seeing if they're paying attention.
23	And in the course of this trial, I am very impressed
24	with the attention that you have given to the witness

testimony, to the exhibits that have been presented to you,

10:40:36 25

1 and to the arguments of counsel. 2 And on behalf of the parties and counsel and myself, 3 I'm very grateful for that. 4 At the beginning of the selection process, I told you that jury selection -- or serving on a jury is a very high 10:40:52 5 civic duty. And you're probably aware of this, but this 6 7 right to a trial by jury is in our constitution. It's part 8 of the Seventh Amendment. And the Seventh Amendment says 9 that the right to trial by jury in civil cases will be preserved. 10:41:15 10 11 The Seventh Amendment lives and has meaning in this 12 courtroom today because of what you're doing. And because 13 of this very important role that you are playing, we are all 14 very, very grateful. 10:41:31 15 Do counsel for plaintiff have anything further before 16 the jury is sent to deliberation? 17 MR. GILBERT: Nothing further. 18 THE COURT: Counsel for the defendant, 19 anything further before the jury is sent to deliberation? 10:41:42 20 MR. DOWNEY: No, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: This Court is in recess pending 22 the return of the verdict. 23 And, Mr. DeVan, will you please escort the jury back

10:41:54 25 DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.

to the jury room.

24

1	
2	(The jury retired to begin deliberations at 10:40 a.m.)
3	
4	THE COURT: If you would, just be seated.
10:42:33 5	Will counsel be waiting here for the jury?
6	MR. GILBERT: We will give you a cell phone.
7	THE COURT: All right.
8	MR. GILBERT: Just in case we leave.
9	THE COURT: Before you before you go
10:42:46 10	leave before you go or I would say whether you're
11	going or not, because you may want to go get something to
12	eat or otherwise be outside the courtroom
13	MR. GILBERT: Okay.
14	THE COURT: please give Mr. DeVan your cell
10:42:59 15	phone numbers. And as soon as the jury comes back with a
16	verdict, or if they have a question, then we'll contact you
17	so that we can proceed as expeditiously as possible.
18	And I do want to thank counsel for their good work in
19	this trial, for their professionalism, for their
10:43:17 20	cooperation. It's made my job much easier than otherwise.
21	So there being nothing further for either side at this
22	time?
23	MR. DOWNEY: Nothing further from defense,
24	Your Honor.
10:43:28 25	THE COURT: We're in recess until we have a

1	verdict or a question.
2	MR. GILBERT: Thank you.
3	MR. DOWNEY: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Just one more thing for the
10:44:05 5	record.
6	Will counsel affirm for me that they've reviewed the
7	exhibits, and they concur that the exhibits that are being
8	sent back to the jury room are the exhibits that have been
9	admitted?
10:44:18 10	Plaintiffs?
11	MS. GREENE: Yes, Judge.
12	THE COURT: And defendants?
13	MS. WILLIAMSON: Yes, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: All right. Very well.
10:44:23 15	
16	(Proceedings in recess at 10:43 a.m.)
17	
18	DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
19	
13:18:16 20	(Proceedings reconvened at 1:20 p.m.)
21	(In Open Court - Defendant Present)
22	
23	THE COURT: The jury has asked to see the
24	video/audio that was admitted into the evidence.
13:18:47 25	We will bring the jury out. It will be played for

1	them. No comment by the Court. No comment by the counsel.
2	And after they're satisfied that they have had their
3	opportunity, we'll send them back to continue to deliberate.
4	Bring in the jury.
13:19:07 5	DEPUTY CLERK: All rise for the jury.
6	
7	(In Open Court - Defendant and Jury Present)
8	
9	THE COURT: This is exhibit number
13:19:25 10	MS. WILLIAMSON: 1013, I think.
11	Defendant's 1013.
12	THE COURT: 1013. Thank you.
13	DEPUTY CLERK: Please be seated.
14	QUESTION FROM THE JURY
13:20:34 15	THE COURT: The jury has requested the
16	opportunity to review that portion of defendant's
17	Exhibit 1013 admitted into evidence.
18	The jury is back in the courtroom, counsel is also
19	present, and arrangements have been made to play just that
13:20:52 20	portion of the exhibit that has been admitted.
21	DEPUTY CLERK: There's two little portions.
22	Two separate ones.
23	THE COURT: All right. And I understand that
24	counsel excuse me counsel have reviewed the exhibit,
13:21:03 25	and they're satisfied that what will be displayed on the

1	monitors will be that which was admitted, correct.
2	Plaintiffs?
3	MR. GILBERT: Correct.
4	THE COURT: Defendants.
13:21:13 5	MS. WILLIAMSON: Correct.
6	THE COURT: Please proceed.
7	(Video portion 1 played in open court.)
8	(Video portion 2 played in open court.)
9	THE COURT: Is the jury satisfied that they've
13:22:38 10	had an opportunity to review this exhibit?
11	(Jury responds in the affirmative.)
12	THE COURT: You are?
13	(Jury responds in the affirmative.)
14	THE COURT: Okay.
13:22:53 15	Thank you. And you will return and continue your
16	deliberations.
17	DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
18	
19	(The jury retired to continue deliberations at 1:22 p.m.)
13:23:35 20	
21	THE COURT: Just please be seated. We'll wait
22	for Mr. DeVan to get back.
23	DEPUTY CLERK: I'm back.
24	THE COURT: All right.
13:23:43 25	Mr. DeVan has your contact information in the event

(In Open Court - Defendant and Jury Present)

24

15:27:21 25

1	THE COURT: Who speaks as the foreperson for
2	this jury.
3	Could you please stand and identify yourself by your
4	jury number.
15:27:31 5	JURY FOREPERSON: Juror Number 4.
6	THE COURT: Has the jury unanimously agreed
7	upon its verdict.
8	JURY FOREPERSON: Yes, we have.
9	THE COURT: Please hand the verdict form to
15:27:41 10	Mr. DeVan.
11	The verdict will now be published in open court.
12	Please pay close attention as the verdict is published.
13	Following publication, the jury may be polled.
14	Each juror may be asked individually whether the
15:28:31 15	verdict as published constitutes his or her individual
16	verdict in all respects.
17	Mr. DeVan, please publish the verdict.
18	DEPUTY CLERK: Liability, the excessive force
19	claim.
15:28:53 20	"We the jury, on the plaintiff's excessive force claim
21	under 42 U.S.C. 1983, find the following as to
22	Defendant Frazier: Not liable.
23	"Each of us jurors concurring the said verdict assigns
24	his or her name hereto on this 22nd date of February, in the
15:29:14 25	year 2019, signed by the foreperson and the seven other

1	THE COURT: Juror Number 6.
2	Is the verdict as published your individual verdict in
3	all respects?
4	JUROR 6: Yes.
15:30:30 5	THE COURT: Juror Number 7.
6	Is the verdict as published your individual verdict in
7	all respects?
8	JUROR 7: Yes.
9	THE COURT: And Juror Number 8.
15:30:41 10	Is the verdict as published your individual verdict in
11	all respects?
12	JUROR 8: Yes.
13	THE COURT: The Court will file and record the
14	verdict.
15:30:58 15	I hereby discharge the jury with the thanks of the
16	Court and the thanks of the parties.
17	DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
18	(The jury exited the courtroom.)
19	DEPUTY CLERK: Please be seated.
15:31:52 20	THE COURT: On behalf of myself and my staff
21	and the Court, I want to thank and compliment counsel for
22	their professionalism, civility, and cooperation in this
23	matter.
24	Counsel for the plaintiff, do you have anything
15:32:12 25	further for the Court at this time?

1	MR. GILBERT: Nothing further.
2	THE COURT: Counsel for the defendant,
3	anything further for the Court at this time?
4	MR. DOWNEY: No.
15:32:18 5	Thank you, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Do counsel wish to speak to the
7	jurors?
8	MR. GILBERT: Yes.
9	THE COURT: I will convey your request to the
15:32:26 10	jurors, and I will advise you as to whether or not they
11	choose to speak to you.
12	MR. GILBERT: Thank you.
13	THE COURT: There being no further business
14	before the Court in this case, we are adjourned.
15:32:39 15	DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
16	
17	(Proceedings concluded at 3:32 p.m.)
18	
19	CERTIFICATE
20	
21	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
22	from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
23	
24 25	/s/ Donnalee Cotone21st of April, 2019 DONNALEE COTONE, RMR, CRR, CRC DATE Realtime Systems Administrator
	<u> </u>